

**REMARKS**

**INTRODUCTION**

Claims 1-28 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

**PRIOR ART REJECTIONS**

Using independent claim 1 as an example, this claim recites acquiring the program guide information for the received program received on the preferential channel. A resulting advantage of this feature is that only a single tuner is required.

Claim 1 also recites the remaining guide information is acquired according to a selectively prioritized channel search. This prioritized channel search improves efficiency of the searching operation. An example of the prioritized channel search is when the user selects an up channel button, the direction of the EPG acquiring is upward because the probability that the user subsequently selects the up channel button again is higher.

The Examiner relies upon column 4, lines 39-42 of Kim as corresponding to this feature. However, this portion teaches that only the channels desired by the user are checked for EPG information.

With respect to Mankovitz, the Examiner relies upon column 6, lines 35-55. However, this portion generally refers to searching for guide information. Specifically, if no guide information is in the signal received from the cable box, then the tune switch 701 switches to another signal source, such as an antenna. Tune switch 701 switches to satellite receiver 733 if guide information is still not found. The various channels of antenna and satellite services are searched. However, there is no priority when searching among the channels.

With respect to Cuccia, the Examiner relies upon column 3, line 54 to column 4, line 64. This portion teaches that the tuner 103 successively selects all received transport streams. Cuccia, col. 4, ln. 16. Thus, the claimed prioritized search is not taught.

The remaining references do not overcome the above deficiencies in Mankovitz, Kim and Cuccia.

## CONCLUSION

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. And further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited. At a minimum, this Amendment should be entered at least for purposes of Appeal as it either clarifies and/or narrows the issues for consideration by the Board.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited and possibly concluded by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss any such remaining issues.

If there are any underpayments or overpayments of fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge and/or credit the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 6-25-05

By:   
Michael J. Badagliacca  
Registration No. 39,099

1201 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501